

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed March 4, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20. By way of the foregoing amendments and the markings to show changes, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2 and 3, and added claims 21-29. The foregoing amendments are taken in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicant would otherwise be entitled in view of the prior art.

### I. Rejections under 35 USC 102 and 103

The Office Action rejected claims 1-20 under 35 USC 102 and/or 103 as being unpatentable over one or more of the following references: Locke et al. (US 6,291,019); Burton (US 5,925,466); Wade et al. (US 5,580,945); Meader, Jr. et al (US 4,025,683); Uhrhan et al. (US 4,145,512); Thomaidis et al. (US 5,626,840); Primeaux, II et al. (US 5,731,397); Wayne (US 4,341,412). Applicants traverse these rejections, however, Applicants have amended claims 1-3 to expedite prosecution. Applicants believe that claims 1-3 are presently allowable along with claims 4-29 dependent thereon.

### II. Double Patenting

The Office Action rejected claims 1-20 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting over claims 1-31 of U.S. Patent No. 6,613,389. A terminal disclaimer is submitted herewith to overcome the rejection.

### III. New Claims

Applicants have added claims 21-29 to address various aspect of the present invention.

By amending the application, the Applicants do not concede that the patent coverage available to them would not extend as far as the original claim. Rather, Applicants intend to file a continuation application to pursue the breadth of the claims as filed. Applicants believe that the Examiner has not made a sufficient showing of inherency of the teachings of the asserted prior art, especially given the

lack of teachings in the cited references of the properties that Applicants have recited in their claims.

Further, by the present amendment, it does not follow that the amended claims have become so perfect in their description that no one could devise an equivalent. After amendment, as before, limitations in the ability to describe the present invention in language in the patent claims naturally prevent the Applicants from capturing every nuance of the invention or describing with complete precision the range of its novelty or every possible equivalent. See, Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 62 USPQ2d 1705 (2002). Accordingly, the foregoing amendments are made specifically in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicants would otherwise be entitled.

#### **CONCLUSIONS**

In view of Applicants' amendments and remarks, the Examiner's rejections are believed to be rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issue at the earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any question or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (248) 593-9900.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent the abandonment of this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge our Deposit Account No. 04-1512 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5-26, 2004

Customer No. 25215



Scott A. Chapple  
Registration No. 46,287  
DOBRUSIN & THENNISCH PC  
401 S. Old Woodward Ave., Ste. 311  
Birmingham, MI 48009  
(248) 593-9900